

Glaring example of Treacherous Betrayal by The bourgeois reformist social democratic LEADERSHIP

The heroic struggle conducted by two million railway employees and the members of their families, in the present background of mounting economic crisis, the continuation of this struggle with indomitable courage, firm determination and unbreakable unity of the railway employees till the end of the strike, defying all conceivable oppressive measures by Mrs. Gandhi's Government to humiliate and suppress this glorious struggle, has no parallel in the history of the strike-struggles in the world.

We would like to recall that this was a strike embracing two million railway employees and seventy lakh persons considering the members of the families who took an active part in the struggle and showed no less heroism in their resistance. Mrs. Gandhi's Government had taken resort to the unheard of barbaric fascistic and despotic measures to crush the strike. Her administration in a despotic manner had not only deployed the Police, BSF, CRP but also engaged hired goondas to mount shameless atrocities on striking railway employees and their family members—even the womenfolk were disgraced and humiliated in a savage way and tried to keep the railway wheels running by forced labour, a heinous crime which no civilised Government can even tolerate. It was her Government which had systematically planned and carried out ruthless oppressions which beggar all descriptions. But in spite of this wheel of oppression the two million employees stood like a rock supported by their family members and other working people and showed no sign of surrendering their just cause or relaxing their struggle.

Still notwithstanding, such tremendous unity, heroism of the railway workers, that even such a promising struggle simply because of vacillating, opportunist bourgeois reformist leadership could

not be led to its desired end once again brings out one important lesson before the railway employees and the working class at large, that so long the various social democratic forces, acting as a force of compromise between labour and capital even under the garb of communism, exercise their dominant influence over the working class movement in our country, till then, no struggle, however wide spread, militant and potentially rich it may be, can be made successful and pushed to its logical culmination.

Such a historic lesson is easily revealed if we care to analyse the conduction and leadership of the recent railway strike.

Before we start the actual analysis of the strike and the role played by the three parties namely the SP, the CPI and the CPI(M) comprising the bulwark of the leadership, we like to acquaint our readers, in a nutshell with the motives and sinister designs that worked behind the outrageous acts and dictatorial attitude of Mrs. Gandhi and her Government regarding this railwaymen's strike. During the strike we analysed this phenomena and exposed the motive of the Government in detail in our earlier issue (Prol. Era, dt. 15.5.74.) and in the present Column for want of space we would like to touch only the cardinal point.

At one stage the rail-
(Contd. to Page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 7
No. 18

25th JUNE, '74
TUESDAY

PRICE 25 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR EXPLOSION BY INDIA

The Central Committee of the SUCI in a statement issued on 20th May 1974 on atomic explosion of India, inter alia stated that "in a capitalist country like ours, explosion of nuclear device, be it on the pretext of 'scientific development' or of 'peaceful purpose' etc, making a colossal wastage of state

exchequer created by the sucking of blood of the starving millions groaning under the grinding machine of capitalist exploitation, cannot delight any right-thinking person—more so, when the country is passing through a serious man-made power crisis causing not only untold sufferings and creating

many hazards in the domestic life and even in the hospitals but also leading to lay off, retrenchment of workers and even in many cases, virtual collapse of existing industries. When a government cannot spend or is unwilling to spend as the case may be only fifteen to twenty crores of rupees required for making necessary repairs of existing generating machines and for the installation of new power-generators to get rid of this man-made power crisis, the plea of utilising atomic energy for 'peaceful' and 'development purposes' in support of such a colossal wastage of public money for nuclear explosion cannot but rouse the anger and indignation of our people."

The statement adds, "So long the forces of peace cannot prevail upon the imperialists and compel them to accept and implement complete nuclear disarmament and total destruction of nuclear weapons, it is the boundenduty of every class-conscious worker to support all efforts by the socialist states not only to attain nuclear superiority but also to constantly remain ahead of the imperialists in
(Contd. to Page 6)

Comrade. Subodh Banerjee Hospitalised

Com. Subodh Banerjee, a member of the Central Committee of our party is passing through a critical stage in the School of Tropical Medicine, Calcutta where he had been admitted since 11th June '74 after the relapse of his old disease, leukomia. He is under the treatment of a renowned haematologist, Dr. A. K. Basu.

Com. Banerjee is being provided with the latest modern treatment of this disease including application of steroid, transfusion of blood and administering of scarce injection 'Oncovin' once a week, the requisite quota of which the party could procure in time. As soon as the Government came out with announcement that they were bringing some consignments of "Oncovin" injection for Com. Banerjee, the party had informed the Government that the party had already procured these injections for Com. Banerjee and so the Government might deposit these injections to Hospital for other needy patients.

In order to continue this treatment as long as required and in the best possible way, the party has appealed to all members, supporters sympathisers, friends, well-wishers and the members of the public to contribute generously to his "Treatment Fund."

The party takes this opportunity to express its indebtedness to Mr. Pradip Kr. Guha and Dr. M. M. Chatterjee who have come forward to donate three vials of "Oncovin."

Mrs. Gandhi knew she was playing with fire—Thanks to the versatile (!) leadership for pouring cold water into fire !

(Contd. from Page 1)

way administration designed a plan to replace steam engines by electric and diesel engines which ultimately failed. But the result of such planning was that the further production of steam engines were stopped and even the old engines were not properly repaired and maintained. A consequent effect of this was disastrous on railway transport system which was virtually on the brink of collapse. Huge amounts of coal, products of steel and other industries were lying dumped in coal fields and factories for want of transport facilities. This created much inconveniences to the industrialists and business houses. The Government was facing severe criticism from these quarters. Even a monopolist like Birla could not restrain himself and publicly questioned the efficiency of the Railway Ministry of their own Government and bitterly criticised the functioning of the railway administration, particularly in regard to the railway transport system. He had even gone to the extent of openly charging and accusing the railway administration of their own Government for its dismal failure to provide the necessary transport facilities, which in his opinion was mainly responsible for accentuating the present industrial crisis. When the Government was faced with such scathing criticism and the Government's callousness and inefficiency was on the verge of almost being publicly exposed, against which no reasonable account could be shown, the railwaymen's strike notice came in its hands. The Government at once like any other despotic ruler saw in it the possibility of exploiting the opportunity to realise their two sinister designs at a time.

Firstly, the Government tried to shift the entire burden of their own

inefficiency on the shoulder of the railwaymen and for that purpose, deliberately created conditions for pushing the railwaymen to strike. So instead of adopting a conciliatory attitude and trying its utmost to resolve the dispute through negotiation, it on the filthy plea of impending strike, cancelled almost four hundred passenger carrying trains, more than eighty percent of which were run by steam engines, to the extreme inconveniences and sufferings of the public. It diverted all these engines for hauling goods trains, thus preparing necessary transitory arrangements for the transport of dumped coal, industrial products and for speedy disposal of essential commodities at different centres. Almost simultaneously it started arresting leaders and thousands of workers, lathi-charging and brutally assaulting railwaymen at different places, began issuing most provocative and humiliating statements while the negotiation was still going on, and ultimately closed down all doors of negotiation. In this way the Government itself had precipitated a situation where the railway employees were left with only two alternatives, either to abjectly surrender or to go on strike.

Moreover, under the prevailing circumstances of the growing economic crisis, ruthless exploitation and oppression of the masses, coupled with boundless and all round corruption in the administration, that created a well-nigh explosive situation in the country, Indira Government was apprehensive of a nation-wide mass upheaval which might break out at anytime in the future. Now, if the railwaymen, controlling the artery of national life and the other industrial workers had combined with that upheaval then it would have been impossible for the

Government to survive. Before that eventuality might become a reality the Government was out to smash the morale of the railwaymen vis-a-vis the industrial workers by crushing the struggle of the railwaymen by any means even if that would be the worst type of fascistic repression that any civil Government could not even dream of, with the expectation that the railwaymen would not be able to mobilise and close up their ranks and organise struggles within the next ten to fifteen years. Only these could explain the Government's most dictatorial attitude and the heinous way in which it handled the railwaymen's strike. Or otherwise, what earthly reasons could there be for closing all doors of negotiation, pushing the railwaymen to strike and then launching unheard of fascistic onslaught for smashing the struggle of the fighting railwaymen? This would become further clear if anyone would analyse and compare the Government's attitude and actions in regard to the present railwaymen's strike with that of the attitude and actions it adopted in almost a similar case, during the locomen's strike a few months back. During that strike the Government, with a view to settling the dispute, arranged to carry the leaders to Delhi by plane at its own expenses and started negotiation on its own initiative even after the workers had gone to strike; whereas this time, it through its deliberate and precipitated actions closed down all doors of negotiation and pushed the railwaymen to strike and afterwards took recourse to the inconceivable fascistic and despotic measures to smash the strike.

Now a pertinent question naturally arises, whether the leadership was at all aware of what the Government was after. Had it been so, the entire

approach, behaviour and actions of the leadership would have been altogether different both before and during the entire period of strike.

Now if for argument's sake we accept that the leadership was able to grasp the motives and designs of Indira Gandhi and her Government, one would at once naturally ask, then why did the leadership not make the necessary preparations before entering into the struggle and even during the entire period of struggle? Why did it not come forward with a concrete programme of action to give the spontaneous resistance of the railwaymen an organised shape on the one hand and on the other develop mass resistance movements involving mass organisations and other trades unions in support of railwaymen's struggle to meet the challenge of such a dictatorial Government and thereby frustrate its all sinister designs? Under the circumstances, if one does not intent to attribute to the leadership hypocrisy, one will have to invariably conclude that its simplicity was of primitive nature; and hence it was fully incompetent to lead such a gigantic struggle with immense possibilities, in view of the fact that the motive behind the Government's actions during the entire period of strike was palpably clear to even a layman.

In fact it was the weakness, dull-witted vacillating bourgeois reformist and opportunistic outlook, attitude and the behavior of the SP, the CPI and the CPI(M) comprising the bulwark of the leadership, that actually provided the ground for Mrs. Indira Gandhi's so-called "firm stand". Because, she could well assess before hand how far this leadership could go in conducting railwaymen's strike. Otherwise, she would not have dared to adopt

such a dictatorial attitude in regard to such a massive and gigantic railwaymen's strike, which was fraught with dangerous consequences for her and her Government. As she was sure of the character of the leadership, she could dare take the calculated risk. She also knew that she was playing with fire. Thanks to the versatile (!) leadership for pouring cold water on the fire.

The vacillating and utter irresponsible character of the leadership was clearly evident from the fact that just at the beginning of the struggle, almost all the leading organisers of these three parties in the railwaymen went underground to evade arrest but did not maintain any contact with the fighting workers, while another section including some topmost leaders went to the safe custody of the Jail. Both these sections completely detached themselves callously from the fighting railwaymen and thus shirked off their responsibility of remaining with the railwaymen and organising the railwaymen and their struggle.

Now anyone who would like to make a serious probe, why such a gigantic struggle with immense possibilities met with such a calamity, as a first and foremost task, would have to make a critical analysis of the base political approaches and angularities of these three parties namely the SP, the CPI and the CPI(M) who constituted the main pillars of the leadership.

Let us first take the case of the SP. This party has come out of the old socialists, the Congress socialists and is a well-known social-democratic force in the country. It speaks of democratic socialism and advocates for bringing about socialism within the frame-work of the present Parliamentary system. This socialism has

To Cover up Criminal Acts of Mrs Gandhi and Her Government— CPI(M) Suppressed Particular Aspects of Repression

no basic difference with the brand of socialism as preached by Mrs. Gandhi. After announcing democratic socialism as her objective and particularly after the bank nationalisation and raising of other so-called radical slogans, Mrs. Gandhi has taken away almost all the guns of democratic socialism of the socialists. So what is now left for the socialists is to make bungling and phrasemongering in the economic struggle of the masses and thereby try utmost to keep their leadership over a section of the people. Hence only one way is left open to them, that is to snatch opportunities to make stunts, and there is no bigger perspective of struggle before them. So it is futile to expect of these socialists that they would further develop this gigantic struggle with immense potentialities to a higher plane and give a well-organised and protracted shape to this struggle.

But those who still claim themselves as Marxists-Leninists, speak of revolution, boast themselves as revolutionaries, be they the advocates of people's democratic revolution or national democratic revolution in our country—what was their basic political approach towards this gigantic railway strike having immense potentialities? Did they not like the socialists betray a social-democratic approach by openly advocating for restraining the struggle as against its further extension, by disrupting the struggle as against its unity and even sabotaging the struggle? Take the case of the CPI for instance. The CPI leader Mr. Dange said during the course of struggle that the strike in railways should not be continued for more than 4 or 5 days as it would severely jeopardise the national economy and ruin our country. It is the same logic as put forth by Mrs. Gandhi in the interest of Indian

monopolists. But there is nothing to wonder at such utterances of the CPI leaders particularly in view of the fact, that the CPI politics is hamstrung by the attitude of the revisionist leadership of the CPSU on the one hand and CPI's present alliance with the Congress(R) on the other.

But regarding this gigantic struggle which was full of immense possibilities, what had been the attitude of the 'profound revolutionaries' namely the CPI(M) who have not mastered enough courage to announce openly its slowly growing friendship with the revisionist leadership of the CPSU and also have not been able to develop as yet understanding with Mrs. Gandhi beyond the tacit plane? It is not our intention to say that they had not rendered their vocal support to the strike or were found wanting in making fiery speeches on the occasion. These they had done profusely. But certainly these speeches and the statements which they made in support of the strike could not cover up their basic bourgeois reformist approach to this gigantic strike with immense possibilities vis-à-vis their CPI-SP like behavior at every stage of development of the railwaymen's struggle.

Lest anybody thinks that we are making baseless charges against the CPI(M) we are giving below the following facts which will speak for themselves. The CPI leader Dange, just after the launching of railway strike began to say that the strike should not be continued for more than four or five days. It is quite clear that owing to the particular nature of politics as pursued by the CPI, its base political approach regarding the strike cannot be different from that of the Socialist Party.

But let us see if the CPI(M) also had any fundamental difference in their base political approach

with that of the CPI and the SP.

There can be no two opinions that the most essential task before the CPI(M)—if they were Marxists-Leninists at all and if their basic political outlook in regard to the democratic movement was like that of a revolutionary—was to co-ordinate, or at least try to co-ordinate, consolidate and develop this gigantic struggle to a higher plane.

And if they had a perspective of developing such a gigantic struggle with immense possibilities to a higher plane then they should have to put forward a concrete programme of action and try their utmost to give an organised shape to the spontaneous resistance of the railwaymen and their families against the brutal repressive measures of Indira Gandhi's Government for a sustained and protracted battle. It was their bounden duty then, firstly, to chalk out a detailed programme of action for developing mass resistance movement involving the workers of different industries, the different mass organisations like students, teachers, youths, women, peasants etc., against the brutal repressive measures of the Government, in support of the railwaymen's struggle, secondly, to try their utmost to give a co-ordinated, organised shape to the unco-ordinated and spontaneously developed railwaymen's struggle and thirdly, after fully utilising the party machineries for fulfilling these two tasks, what needed most, was the deployment of their MPs and other leaders who enjoy immunity against brutal police oppression, to different railway centres for remaining by the side of the fighting railwaymen in order to try to protect them from the atrocities let loose by the Government repressive machinery on the one hand and on the other to provide guidance on the spot so

that the spontaneous resistance of the railwaymen and their families might be given a co-ordinated organised shape for a prolonged and sustained battle.

Had they engaged their MPs for the purpose and if for argument's sake, we agree to, that in the circumstances the MPs also would not have been spared by the police, still we think that they should have to face that. Because in that case that would have exposed the hollowness of our parliamentary democracy to the bone and that incident alone could put Indira Gandhi and her Government on the dock before the people both nationally and internationally.

But they did not even try to do that. On the contrary we found that their MPs and other leaders who enjoy immunity were solely busy at Delhi in hobnobbing with Mrs. Gandhi and her Government to find out anyhow a compromising formula for withdrawing the strike.

A pertinent question is, what purpose does it serve by making such people MPs and leaders enjoying immunity, if they do not act in a way as expected of them at the critical hour of the mass struggle? Surely our fighting people do not need MPs, the most privileged section of our people, for only to make high sounding tall talks and lectures on struggle without taking even the least risk. On the contrary, the people can rightfully demand of these MPs and those leaders who enjoy immunity to remain by their side, in order to protect them from brutal police repression at the critical hour of any movement and mass struggle and guide them on the spot, so that their resistance against the brutal oppressive measures of the Government might be given a co-ordinated organised shape for a prolonged and sustained battle.

In fact these tasks can only be fulfilled by the MPs and the leaders who enjoy immunity and no other leader and worker, who may be very competent in other fields of activity can effectively do it. Moreover, in that case there would be only unnecessary casualty but the real tasks would not be fulfilled at all.

It is no doubt astonishing that these people, who pose themselves as revolutionaries, lack the political maturity and boldness that even the national bourgeois leaders manifested at times during the period of nationalist movement, in the matter of utilising and exercising their leaders immunity.

Moreover, instead of placing any concrete programme of action, in the conventions of the railwaymen, the meetings of the Central TU organisations, the NCCRS and its Action Committee or from their own party platforms, for developing popular mass resistance movement involving all the trades union organisations, the different mass organisations of students teachers, youths, women, peasants etc. in support of the railwaymen's strike and against the brutal repressive measures of the Government and giving a co-ordinated and organised shape to the unco-ordinated, and spontaneously developed railwaymen's struggle, the CPI(M) simply issued statements expressing their support and sympathy and condemning Government's repressive measures, and that too in a most general term without specifically mentioning the nature of the atrocities, such as deployment of hired goondas and even hired prostitutes (what actually happened in Kanchrapara Railway Colony in West Bengal—it is reported) in assaulting the female members of the families of the railway employees and compelling the arrested railwaymen on point of gun to forced labour. Over and above, hardly a couple of days could pass after the

(Contd to Page 4)

Rammurti opposed to Involve the Masses in Support of the Struggle. He observed 'Don't Add Dimension to this Struggle'.

(Contd. from Page 3)

beginning of the struggle when they became very much restive for withdrawing the strike as early as possible on any compromising formula, and for that purpose, they along with their MPs and other leaders, just like the CPI and the SP leaders and together with them, began a to and fro motion like a shuttle-cock between Indira Gandhi and her Government on the one side and the Action Committee and the NCCRS on the other.

In regard to the Kanchrapara incident, where Indira Gandhi's administration engaged hired goondas and prostitutes in assaulting, molesting and torturing the female members of the railwaymen's families, even after the people of the said locality and moreover the mother of an assaulted girl narrated the incident to Md. Ismail, M.P., and a well known CPI(M) trade union leader, who went there as a member of the Trade Union team that visited the place, to our utter surprise we noted that the whole incident was reported in the CPI(M) daily as a barbarous incident in general terms without highlighting this particular aspect of the repression which was thus intentionally suppressed. Moreover when in the meeting of the local committee of NCCRS we urged to mention this incident in the leaflet that was to be issued by the local Committee of the NCCRS, both the CPI and the CPI(M) leaders stubbornly resisted its inclusion in the said leaflet.

Naturally anyone might rightfully ask, when the bounden duty of any sensible and responsible leadership, be that revolutionary or not, was to highlight these criminal acts, perpetrated by a civil Government, before our common public, world press and the international bodies of the workers of the different countries of

the world in order to put Mrs. Gandhi and her Government on the dock, what motive might there be behind this naked attempt of suppressing this particular aspect of repression other than covering up these criminal acts of Mrs. Gandhi and her Government from the eye of the common public of our country and the world press?

This tricky attempt to relieve Mrs. Gandhi of the responsibility of the criminal activities perpetrated by her Government was nakedly revealed when their leader Mr. Samar Mukherjee MP instead of putting Mrs. Gandhi and her Government on the dock and accusing and charging her for the criminal activities that her Government resorted to, requested her to personally intervene in the Kanchrapara incident as if her hand was clean. And by this action if not directly then at least indirectly they tried to shield her. Their attempt to appease Mrs. Gandhi went to such an extent that when Mrs. Gandhi in a most dictatorial manner once refused to meet the opposition leaders, they along with the leaders of the CPI and the SP instead of condemning such attitude in clear terms simply expressed their 'unhappiness'.

A few more facts will further reveal that the CPI(M) also like the CPI and the SP had not performed the essential task of giving an organised shape to the railwaymen's struggle for a prolonged and sustained battle, in spite of the fact that the railwaymen till the last day showed their indomitable courage beyond question.

When Com. Pritish Chanda, a member of the Central Committee of the SUCI and the Secretary, All India Committee UTUC (Lenin Sarani), who had no locus standi as he was not included as a member of the NCCRS and its Action Committee, in his capacity

as a permanent invitee, (the minimum status which the others had to concede to him as they in spite of their utmost efforts could not ignore the little organisational strength of UTUC (Lenin Sarani) among the railwaymen,) at different stages, placed some concrete suggestions before the meeting of the Central TU organisations, NCCRS and its Action Committee, for strengthening the railwaymen's struggle and developing it to a higher plane, to our utter astonishment and surprise we found that the CPI(M) too, in tune with Dange and along with Dange vehemently opposed Com. Chanda's suggestions.

On 9th May, in a meeting of the Central TU organisations, Com. Chanda placed the proposal of Bharat Bundh in support of and expressing solidarity with, the railwaymen's struggle and along with that placed a concrete suggestion of involving the other sections of the democratic masses, including students, youths, women and teachers etc. in mass movement in support of the fighting railwaymen. The proposal of Bharat Bundh was outright rejected by both Rammurti and Dange. On this issue, after arguments and cross-arguments when ultimately a consensus evolved in favour of giving a call for one day's industrial workers strike, Com. Chanda again reiterated his former proposal of developing mass movements in support of the railwaymen's struggle involving the different sections of the democratic masses like students, youths, women, teachers etc.

Mr. Rammurti along with Dange vehemently opposed this suggestion saying 'Don't add dimension to the railwaymen's struggle'. Now, is there any difference between the CPI and the CPI(M) in their base political approach and outlook in regard to railwaymen's strike, when we find that Mr. Rammurti, a member of the politbureau of the

CPI(M) opposed Com. Chanda's suggestion for adopting a programme of action involving all the trade unions, mass organisations in support of the railwaymen's strike and against the Government's dictatorial and unheard of repressive measures, because he did not want to increase the dimension of the railwaymen's strike which in his opinion should remain confined within the orbit of industrial dispute? Moreover, any man with the ABC knowledge of Marxism-Leninism understands it well that it is only through the exhaustion of the present democratic phase that the people's struggle can be developed to a higher level and there is no other alternative course left for developing revolutionary mass struggle in the correct path. So any genuine Marxist-Leninist who is conscious of his historical responsibility would sincerely attempt to gradually extend the dimension and intensity of the democratic movement through the participation of greater and greater section of the working people in mighty left and democratic struggle; for it is only through this course the exhaustion of the present democratic phase and the developing of the struggle to the higher level can be achieved. But Mr. Rammurti categorically opposed to add dimension to the struggle which was itself gigantic and full of immense possibilities, particularly in the background of mounting economic crisis, all round boundless administrative corruption, ruling Congress (R) party fastly losing its ground among the public, and unprecedented in view of the spontaneous mass support the striking railwaymen received this time from every walk of life. Naturally, one may rightfully ask him, what for is his party i.e. the CPI(M) in the democratic movement? This clearly expresses beyond any shadow of doubt that apart

from tactical differences and differences in phrasing their real intent and basic political approach to democratic movement is in no way different from that of the CPI and the SP.

Again on 24th May, in a meeting of the Central TU organisations, Com. Chanda placed a proposal that in order to secure further advance of the railwaymen's struggle, a programme for solidarity action and sustained relay strike in all the big industries and Government undertakings should be adopted. While it was opposed by Dange, Rammurti did not extend even the least support to this proposal. To this effect and in continuation of this suggestion of Com. Chanda, with a view to developing a state-wide movement in support of railwaymen's struggle, Com. Fatik Ghosh, Secretary West Bengal Committee, UTUC (Lenin Sarani), in his letter dated 24th May submitted a written proposal for consideration, to CITU and other Trades Union and mass organisations. But it was really astonishing that the CITU could not yet find time to reply even.

In spite of all these facts before us and the people of the country it is queer indeed that after the withdrawal of the strike Mr. Ranadive, member of the Politbureau and a well known leader of the CPI(M) has observed 'the negotiations on the morrow of the strike, the useless discussion round the three point formula all of which not only diverted attention from the main task of strengthening the struggle and linking the leadership directly with the masses. It also raised high hopes in the government circles that the strike can be easily crushed and defeated.' (Peoples Democracy dt. 2.6.74) Our humble submission is, who performed 'the negotiations' about which Ranadive expressed his nauseating attitude? Does he not know that they

(Contd. to Page 5)

Ranadive now uttering big talks—what was he doing when stalwarts of CPI(M) were engaged in betraying the struggle ?

(Contd from Page 4)

were his party leaders and MPs who along with the leaders of the CPI and the SP persistently continued 'the negotiations' with Mrs. Gandhi and her Government? Is he not aware of this act? Again, Mr. Ranadive has raised the issue of 'linking with the masses'. Well, but who opposed the very proposal of involving the democratic people in mass movement and thereby linking the railwaymen's struggle with the masses, by stating that 'Don't add dimension to the struggle'? Was it not Mr. Rammurti, another member of the politbureau of the CPI(M) and a Comrade-in-arms of Ranadive? Did Rammurti, a member of the Politbureau of the CPI(M) and the Secretary CITU said in contravention to Ranadive, another member of the Politbureau and the President of the CITU? What Ranadive was doing when Rammurti, Surjit, Samar Mukherjee the stalwarts of the CPI(M) leadership, all combinedly with hand-in-glove with the CPI and the SP leaders were engaged in paving the way for leading the struggle to a calamitous end?

Now let us examine what role our CPI(M) friends played in regard to the much discussed three point formula which according to Ranadive 'diverted attention from the main task of strengthening the struggle'. On 11th May morning, the parliamentary opposition leaders of the CPI, CPI(M) and SP along with some other opposition MPs met Mrs. Gandhi and her cabinet colleagues, discussed with them to evolve some formula for getting out of the strike. And out of this discussion emerged the three point formula. But it was no other than Mr. Samar Mukherjee, the CPI(M) MP who was the first person to verbally place the same before the Action Committee, along with his report that when he

asked Mrs. Gandhi about her opinion on the said formula, she replied, 'Let us see, you better continue your discussion with my colleagues'. What does it prove? Does it not prove that Mr. Mukherjee was, if not much but at least interested in the three point formula? Or why should he take so much interest to place it first before the Action Committee? Now the Action Committee rejected the proposal and observed that the said formula was not even placed before the Committee in its proper official form. On the next day, the 12th May, the opposition leaders after duly signing it, sent it to the Action Committee. It was found that four among the signatories were the CPI(M) leaders. Please note that among the party-wise break up of the signatories, the CPI(M)'s quota was the highest! What does Ranadive say about these facts? As because the member of the public do not know all in detail and perhaps Mr. Ranadive thinks our people and railwaymen fool and dull-witted so he dare speaks all these things regarding the three point formula now.

Moreover, it is now being observed that the CPI(M), CITU and particularly Ranadive are trying to put all the blames on the CPI and Dange for sabotaging the strike, because they by their suggestion that as according to them the Action Committee was not competent enough to take decision, the Zonal Committees should decide in regard to the continuation of the strike, had virtually pleaded for withdrawal of the strike and backstabbed it. All know that the CPI is in alliance with the Congress (R) and guided by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union which is maintaining a closer tie with Indira Gandhi. So such a behaviour was neither amazing, astonishing nor unexpected on their part.

But what was the real picture? And what role did our CPI(M) friends play? Was it not a fact that from 16th May and onwards, long before Dange and the CPI placed their suggestion, the CPI(M)'s known leaders, cadres and supporters and workers of the CPI(M) organised unions amongst the railwaymen started joining their work in different centres under various pretexts and under different covers? From the reports so far gathered it has come to light that at Anara, Adra Division Southern Railway, eighty loco drivers of Loco Running Staff Association, a CPI(M) organised union, joined their work. It was further reported that all these men who were followers of Sri S K Dhar, a well known CPI(M) man, member of the NCCRS and Secretary of the said Association joined while Sri Dhar was himself present at Anara. In Southern Railway all the workers of the union controlled by C M Nambiar, a CPI(M) leader, also joined their work during the above mentioned period. At Asansol, Burdwan in West Bengal, and Bangaigaon, Lumding and Pandu in Assam almost all the CPI(M) cadres and active supporters resumed their duties before the strike was called off. A section of the known CPI(M) workers and supporters also joined at Garden Reach, Calcutta, long before the proposal of Dange and the AITUC came into the picture. And where the CPI(M) failed to persuade the workers to join it took recourse to a more nasty tactics. It spread the rumour that payment would be made and induced the workers to go to office for drawing their salaries, knowing fully well that in that case they would be arrested and forced to resume their duties. Is it not sabotage and treacherous betrayal?

All these behaviours of the CPI(M) leaders are sufficient enough to prove that their activities throughout the period of struggle in

regard to the withdrawal of the strike was in no way different from that of the CPI and SP leaders. And we have already shown that so far the base political outlook is concerned in regard to the railwaymen's struggle they had no basic and fundamental difference with the CPI and SP.

Now let us see what were their role and attitude, even at the last phase when betrayal was complete and whether even at that stage, they were genuinely against the withdrawal. The fact is that even at the last moment, when the proposal for withdrawal came from the Jail, it was signed by four leaders, amongst whom one was Mr. Choudhury, who signed on behalf of the Loco Running Staff Association, a CPI(M) organised union. In the last meeting of the Action Committee on the 27th May, it was no body else than Mr. Samar Mukherjee who read out the proposal and said, 'Send it to the press and let it be called off'. Com. Chanda and Priya Gupta, Secretary AIRF said that if the decision for withdrawal of the strike was to be taken on the basis of the suggestion of the four leaders from inside the jail, then minutes and records should be kept and the opinion of all the members present in the meeting must be recorded with. When due to their insistence it was decided that the minutes and records should be kept, and after they recorded their note of dissent against withdrawal when Samar Mukherjee was asked to give their opinion, he said 'Personally (note it 'personally') I disagree. But there is no other alternative but to withdraw the strike'. Even after Com. Chanda clinched the issue that instead of giving his personal opinion, one should give the opinion of his organisation, Mr. Samar Mukherjee refused to give the opinion of their organisation and he simply reiterated what he said earlier. It was also reported that at a stage of discussion, Priya Gupta

categorically told Mr. Samar Mukherjee that if their organisation i.e., CITU would agree to, then they were ready to continue the strike in spite of the suggestion for withdrawal made by four leaders from inside the jail. But Samar Mukherjee did not say anything in the affirmative. Do all these facts behind the screen prove that they were genuinely against the withdrawal of the strike? After all these when we find that they are trying to put the entire blame for the withdrawal of the strike squarely on AITUC and Fernandez group, what shall we speak of these people? Moreover, to our utter surprise we find that in the Peoples Democracy dated 2.6.74, Ranadive, the CITU chief and the so called leftwinger theoretician in the CPI(M) leadership, in order to befool public opinion and their rank and file on this issue, wrote that, 'The determined and courageous fight put up by the NCCRS (National Co-ordination Committee of Railwaymen's struggle) leadership till the forces of compromise over whelmed it will also be remembered'. As if their party does not fall in the category of forces of compromise!

So the behaviour and approach of the leadership, the bulwark of which was constituted of the CPI the SP and the CPI(M) clearly revealed its treacherous betrayal resulting in such a calamitous end of such a gigantic struggle that was full of immense possibilities, particularly in the background of mounting economic crisis, boundless and all round administrative corruption, ruling Congress party fast losing its ground among the public and in view of unprecedented and spontaneous mass support the striking railwaymen enjoyed this time from every walk of life. Even the European moderate Trade Unionists will be ashamed of such hackneyed, dull-witted, vacillating

(Contd. to Page 6)

To lead struggle to its logical culmination —Establish the revolutionary party with correct base political line in the leadership

(Contd. from Page 5)

compromising, behaviour and attitude of the leadership. The European moderate Trade Unionists who never pretend to be revolutionaries, never speak of developing economic struggle and democratic movement to a higher political plane, rather openly advocate economism in the trade union movement—the minimum honesty, determination, courage and perspective they show while they conduct industrial workers struggle, that too were also lacking in the behaviour of the so called Marxists-Leninists and the Socialist leaders who comprised the leadership of the railwaymen's struggle.

Another important lesson that our fighting people and the railwaymen should take from this struggle is, how heinous can be the role of the revisionists at crucial hour of struggle of the masses.

When the working people throughout the world and the world press fraternized with the railwaymen's valiant struggle and urged upon Indira Gandhi's Government to desist from the destestable, unheard of barbaric and fascistic activities that it launched upon the fighting railwaymen and their families, no voice of even the mildest protest was raised by the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union and their drum boys in the Eastern European countries. The leading organ of the Soviet revisionist leadership i.e., Pravda, instead of expressing solidarity with the fighting railwaymen and condemning the unheard of repression let loose by Indira Gandhi and her Government, at a time when the striking railwaymen were engaged in a life and death struggle against Indira Gandhi's Government, in an editorial warned that the reactionary forces might

take advantage of the strike and raise their heads. Brilliant indeed! Perhaps this revolutionary analysis provided guidelines for the CPI's betrayal.

Lastly before concluding we would like to urge upon the working people in general and the fighting railwaymen in particular that so long they would remain under the influence of social democrats of all shades, their mighty movements would remain arrested within a vicious circle—their militant and vigorous struggles would again and again develop only to meet the same calamitous end. They should realise that so long they do not succeed to free themselves from this evil influence, till then, in spite of their much sacrifices and sufferings, the democratic movements and struggles of the industrial workers can never come out of this vicious circle and reach their logical culmination.

These three parties, namely the SP, the CPI and the CPI(M) have conclusively proved that they are social democratic forces under different nomenclatures. These forces with their high sounding revolutionary phrase-mongering confuse the people, keep themselves in the current of revolution in camouflage, arrest the growth of revolutionary current from within, act as the powerful enemy of revolution within the revolutionary camp. They always act as the compromising force between labour and capital, with a view to protecting the interest of the capital, play a conspiratorial role against the workers, and in the crucial moment, sometimes directly or sometimes indirectly by distracting the attention of the people from the real enemy to a fake one, always disrupt the struggle and stab it from behind.

Those who want to develop every movement in such a way as to give birth to the political power of the masses in order to bring about a fundamental change in the socio-political and economic condition of the country, i.e. revolution, must work hard both individually and collectively to get rid of these social democratic forces of all shades and varieties. They must take the lesson from the behaviour and attitude of the CPI and the CPI(M) in the railwaymen's strike, which once again beyond doubt proved that their theories of national democratic revolution or of peoples democratic revolution are nothing but the different varieties of social democratic trends in the political movements in our country. In this regard one should not forget what Com. Stalin told to the oppressed and toiling masses that it is impossible to put an end to capitalism without putting an end to social democracy.

Moreover, it is only through establishing the real revolutionary political party having the correct base political line and really dedicated to the cause of communism, revolution and progress in the leadership that the struggles of our people would be successfully led to their logical culmination with a view to realising the much cherished transformation of our state and society from Capitalism to Socialism.

We hope, the working people in general and the railwaymen in particular should ponder over it.

Nuclear Explosion

(Contd. from Page 1)

nuclear strength for the preservation of peace and to put an effective check on the threat of nuclear war on the one hand and to frustrate nuclear blackmailing which the imperialists are often taking recourse to in furtherance of their global super-power diplomacy on the other, notwithstanding the fact that it is a colossal wastage of resources. But this argument does not befit in case of a capitalist state. In a capitalist state it only adds to the miseries of the common people, and only helps consolidating the power of the bourgeois class-rule to the detriment of the interest of the common people."

It further stated that, "The Indian bourgeoisie is frantically trying to fan up national jingoistic feelings on this issue with the sole object of distracting the attention of our people from the evergrowing economic crisis and all-round corruption which has been further accentuated by the most corrupt and inefficient administration of Congress Government led by Smt. Indira Gandhi". In this connection the statement "warned our anti imperialist, democratic-minded people against the possible danger of exploiting this situation by the Indian capitalist government in exerting its influence over the Afro-Asian small and under-

developed countries. The Soviet revisionists also, in the background of Indo-Soviet Treaty may utilise this situation, in extending its sphere of influence through the Indian Capitalist Government, their present ally, against the growing influence of People's Republic China in this region."

The statement concluded that "not only the socialists, the well-known social-democrats, but even the CPI(M) and the CPI, who still claim themselves as Marxist-Leninists, have hailed and eulogised this 'success' and have come out in the open to share the so-called 'national pride' in tune with the ruling bourgeois class and other national jingoistic forces. In doing so they have completely gone against the Leninist teachings that in a capitalist state like India it will not only add to the coercive power of the capitalist state and to the untold sufferings and miseries of the common people but also is fraught with other dangers, particularly in view of the fact that Indian capitalism has already reached the stage of imperialism in so far as the growth and development of finance capital, the formation of a financial oligarchy through the merger of banking capital with industrial capital and the extent and amount of export of capital are concerned"

UTUC'S APPEAL

Comrade Sitesh Das-Gupta, Secretary All-India Committee of UTUC (Lenin Sarani) in an appeal urged upon the working people in general and the railway workers and all the State and local committees of the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) and UTUC (Lenin Sarani) rail front in particular the following:

(1) To donate liberally to the Legal Defence and

victimised Railway Employees Aid Fund opened by UTUC (Lenin Sarani).

(2) To observe anti-victimisation campaign in all railway centres.

(3) To send list of all victimised employees with copies of notices of dismissal, removal, suspension etc. to UTUC (Lenin Sarani) central office.